XXXVI—33—Industries

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue):* I move for an additional allotment of Rs. 1,500 under "33-Industries—Direction and Inspection—Travelling Allowance". The note contains everything in support of the demand.

Mr. President: There is a cut motion by Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.

CUT MOTION No. 1

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Mr. President, I move that the allotment of Rs. 1,500 under "33-Industries—Direction and Inspection—Travelling Allowance" be reduced by rupee 1 to ascertain what exactly was the object in undertaking a journey to Calcutta in connection with the Coal Conference and also to get information as to what advantages have accrued from the cost incurred. I wait for the reply.

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue):* There was a meeting held at Calcutta in which they wanted to allot to the various States in India, Coal and Coke. The allotment that was made to our Government was only 4 waggons of coke. There are a large number of industrial concerns in the State which require a large quantity of coal and coke. It was not allocated. It was with a view to influence or to make our representations to the authorities there that he went over to Calcutta to attend a Conference for a large quantity of coal and coke. And then, another journey was undertaken by the expert here in connection with the textile industry, and he is a person who is superintending the work of the leading industries and he went over there to get greater contact with the persons there, to get greater (larger) information as to how it is to be conducted. He is one of those people who got a certificate of merit and the amount is intended to cover the expenses connected with the journeys, one by the Director of Industries and Commerce and the other by one Mr. Swaminathan, the Industrial Inspector.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* One more information is useful, that is what is the requirement of coal and coke to get which the Director of Industries attended the Conference.

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue)*: At present, we are getting only 4 waggons.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* What is our requirement?

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue):* Our requirement is much more than that, over 6 waggons.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Is it 7 waggons?

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue):* About 6 waggons.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* And what is the cost incurred? How many rupees were spent as T.A. and D.A.

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue):* To fly from here to Calcutta and back, an amount of nearly Rs. 850 is required and the additional allotment is required to cover expenses connected with the Textile Conference also, both these come to Rs. 1,500.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Sir, the amounts that are put down in the Budget and asked for through Supplementary Demand, the Government will do well to recognise, comes from the labour of the poor people of the State. With this background, I shall request you, Sir, to reduce your flights unnecessarily taken, to press home to the authorities of Calcutta to get six waggons of coal and coke....

Mr. C. R. Iyyunnni *(Minister for Revenue):* Coke alone is 6 waggons. We wanted 6 waggons of coke, besides that we wanted coal also.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: It makes the position stronger. In connection with a matter of getting whatever it is, the person had to fly from here and probably back because he was wanted here more than there, you have incurred an expenditure of over Rs. 800, the results produced by the flight are not anything much. The result is not, in your own language, commensurate with the expenditure incurred. Therefore, from this specific case, I have other cases also in mind, similar trips though useful to the individual concerned, taken, but returning without much result as is evident from certain other things. My point is, Sir, that the taxpayers' money should not be frittered away, want only frittered away, like this and to press this matter I have made this cut. I do not propose to press it to a division. Therefore, my submission, Sir, is that this sort of expenditure may be reduced to a minimum. I do not say that the trip was unnecessary. Afterall, nothing is gained there, and after studying how to press home a matter like this or rather manipulating,—see the vehemence—there was no use of your flights; therefore do not fitter away the peasants' money.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue)*: Does the Hon'ble Member want that the industrial concerns in the State should not be given any encouragement? Are we to put a stop to their work?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: There is no purpose, Sir, in answering. I want to respect the Chair's wish. Therefore, I am where I am, and you are where you are.

Mr. M. K. Raja *(Mulankunnathukavu)*: On a point of information, Sir. Will the Hon'ble Minister say under what conditions the officers concerned had to make use of the aeroplane, rather than travel by train.

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue)*: There were only three or four days at his disposal and this was hardly sufficient to reach the destination, if he travelled by train.

Mr. M. K. Raja *(Mulankunnathukavu)*: Are we to understand that the notice of the Conference reached only 4 days before the Conference?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: How many days' notice did you get? The date of the Conference, date ofreceipt of notice and the date on which orders were passed, give me these three dates, please.

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue)*: Date of Conference 17th February 1947, Date on which notice was received 7th February 1947. The Director of Industries sent over the papers to the Secretariat 4 days hence *i. e.*, on 11th February 1947 and the final orders were passed on 12th February 1947.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: I have to move the cut, and tell the Government very respectfully in the light of the information supplied that for a conference on 17th February 1947, notice was received on 7th February 1947 I do not see why on this subject a four-days' delay took place in the Director's Office. Yet, I do not know why this unduly over-staffed Secretariat had a delay of one or two days. Orders should have been passed on 11th itself. The flight could then have been avoided. He is an officer who is entitled to a second class fare and that gentleman is travelling from here by plane. If there was expedition of orders, the whole journey could have been managed by train. We are not concerned with the enjoyment of the individual concerned, but we are concerned with the result that the deputy will be able to produce. Your delay is unpardonable and therefore the amount is objectionable. I submit, Sir, don't continue to do this. Stop this. That is the object of the cut. Better accept it. It is only one rupee cut. Does the Government accept the cut motion?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Minister for Food and Education)*: The cut motion has been accepted in the sense that it was to elicit information and this has been supplied.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: And in the sense that it may be reduced by Re. 1.

Mr. President: The Hon'ble Mover, are you pressing the motion?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: I am pressing Home to Government, don't fritter away the peasants' hard-earned money.

Mr. President: Are you pressing the motion?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*, I am not.

Mr. President: Am I to take it that you want leave of the House to withdraw the motion?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadrkkancheri)*: Now I oppose the demand through the cut motion, which under the very able light that came from the Chief Minister is only intended to get information, has been supplied kindly, although I had to hammer it out. This clearly shows that this is a demand which no House having a sense of responsibility to their constituents, namely the taxpayers of Cochin.....

Mr. President: The Hon'ble Member will oppose the motion.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Yes I am opposing. Any representative of the people of Cochin having the sense of responsibility must oppose this, whether he belongs to the Ministerialist Party or not. It is in that sense not to put them into any undue strain. Whether the Government is agreeable to accept the cut motion in the sense in which I put this reduction of one rupee or not, after all, it does not matter much. It is a token cut to show that what you have done is wrong. Of course of a feeble nature I accept it but the result of that performance is that I am constrained because of my sense of responsibility to my constituents, you may his even, and all that time will be reduced from that five minutes as you are responsible for that, (Laughter). The demand will have to be cut down and therefore, Sir, I oppose it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. President : The question before the House is that the Government be granted a sum of Rs. 1,500 under "33-Industries—Direction and Inspection—Travelling Allowance".

Demand put and carried.

XXXVII—33.—Reserved Miscellaneous

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue)*: I rise to move for an additional allotment of Rs. 500 under "33—Reserved—Miscellanceous". The object of this demand is given in the note.

Mr. President : The question is that Government be granted a sum of Rs. 500 under "33—Reserved—Miscellaneous ".

Demand put and carried.

38. 41—Miscelleneous

Mr. C. R. Iyyunni *(Minister for Revenue))*: I move for an additional allotment of Rs. 649 under '41-Miscellaneous—8-Rent Control Measures—Establishment". The note will explain the object of the demand.

Mr. President : There is a cut by Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Minister for Food and Education):* Sir, I rise on a point of order that in these motions many of the cut motions now standing in the order paper are not in order and especially the one standing against this cut. I am not raising this question because there is any attempt to stifle discussion but any attempt to fritter away the time of the House should be avoided and that is why I raised this question. The cut motion has been tabled in order to raise a debate on certain aspects of Rent Control Measures. Such a general point cannot be raised when a demand for supplementary grant is made. That is a point of order I wish to make, and the matter is covered by a previous ruling by the President of this House and that ruling clearly lays down what ought to be the scope of a cut motion when a demand for supplementary grant is made. I may at this stage point out that going by the rules and standing orders there is not even a provision to move a cut motion when a supplementary demand is made. But then it has been the convention here to do it and the restricted scope under which that convention operates is laid down in the previous ruling which I referred to, whereby a cut motion may not be moved to elicit information. It has been laid down for example that a cut motion can raise only a financial question and the policy underlying that matter. Under these circumstances I would request the Chair and especially in view of the large agenda before the House to strictly apply the rules and conventions applicable to cut motions when demands for supplementary grants are made.

Mr. President : What is the previous ruling ?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Minister for Food and Education):* The previous ruling which I referred to is this, Sir. It was a ruling made again by Sir Shanmukham Chetty.

Mr. President : I should like to make an observation regarding the scope of supplementary grants.

I find on the order paper various cut motions. Take for instance, the very first cut motion—to impress upon the Government certain facts. And secondly, there is a motion to ascertain from the Government some information regarding the purchase of Rails, etc. If that were all the object of the Hon'ble Members, it is not necessary to put down the cut motion at all. After a supplementary demand is moved, it is open to any Hon'ble Member to get up and make his own observations on points arising out of a supplementary demand. Therefore, for the purpose of merely asking information from Government, Hon'ble Members need not take the trouble of tabling cut motions.

I wish to make another observation which I have to make in view of item 6 which stands in the name of Mr. Ibrahim who wants to discuss certain irregularities in the recent elections to the Legislative Council. A motion of that nature is entirely out of order on a supplementary demand.

I wish to read out to Hon'ble Members an important ruling that was given on the scope of supplementary demand in the Legislative Assembly.

" A token cut was proposed under a Supplementary Grant and objection being raised on the ground that general questions of policy could not be raised on a supplementary demand :

The President ruled: 'In view of a large number of cuts that have been put down on these Supplementary Grants,' I have taken some trouble to examine the question and I invite the attention of the House to a summary of the position as stated in May's 'Parliamentary Practice', page 536, which I will read to the House :

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly